

Monday, 24 August 2009

• [Question 173 - Is there a conspiracy against you?](#)

Question 173 - Is there a conspiracy against you?

Dear Robert,

Someone put a notice on some website that you are not approved by the Church and that you are not to use the name Catholic. What is he talking about? Is there some conspiracy against you for speaking about the Jews?

John D.

R. Sungenis: John, yes, there is somewhat of a conspiracy against me, and it has been ongoing for about seven years. These days I pay little attention to it because I know the character and the modus operandi of the people involved. They are not the highest caliber of human individual, I can assure you. Anyone who engages in the type of calumnious gossip that these people do on a daily basis has either got to be insanely obsessed or downright evil. They pore over my words, parsing each sentence that I write, hoping to find some off-kilter remark so that they can create as bad an impression of me as possible to their ideological sycophants. They knit and weave various things I've written over the years, piecing them together out of context, and magically turning me into a Mr. Hyde that they can tar and feather at their own whim. They accuse me of all kinds of sinister motives, plots, crimes, and falsehoods. The truth is, except for a few minor misquotes, they haven't proven any allegation against me in all the years they've been at it. Their conclusions are based on exaggerations and innuendo. Even then, I took down the critiques I wrote as a gesture of good will, but they still weren't satisfied. They were determined to bring me down, and some of them even admitted it on various blogs.

One also needs to inquire about the credentials and motivations of these people. Does the public recognize them as authorities on this or any relevant subject? Does the public recognize them as people who disseminate their ideas without bias? Are they sought out as speakers in public venues on these or any relevant issues? Do publishers of books or magazines seek to distribute their material? Do institutions of higher learning seek for their opinion? Have they debated anyone in public who has an opposite opinion? Have they ever written anything critical of the people they defend? Or is their only claim to fame that they can make a website and spread unsubstantiated allegations by taking things out of context and looking at them in the worst possible light?

As for motivations, do they first come to the accused with their allegations and ask for an explanation or do they throw up as much slime as they can against the wall hoping that something will stick? Do they stop to think that they, against canon law, are harming someone's reputation? Do they ever recognize that their opponent's analysis, based on positive comments of others not affiliated with them, has merit, or do they merely form knee-jerk reactions which arbitrarily reject anything their opponent says or writes? Do they go on other websites and spread slander against their opponent in an attempt to win people to their side, without seeking the opponent's response? Do they have ideological backgrounds and sympathetic affiliations with the people they defend? Do they have grudges against their opponents because they were disillusioned from past experiences and thus have decided to get back at the opponent? Have they been influenced by money, fame or pressure from others? What is their political affiliation? Their worldview? Their interpretation of Scripture? Their view of history? I think when you get the answers to all these questions you will find that everything they say has to be taken with a grain of salt, and sometimes the whole salt cellar.

Rather than seek retribution against them, I can only feel sorry for them, not only because they refuse to acknowledge even some of the things I write about this subject, but more for the fact that in their calumny they are preparing themselves for a harsh punishment on Judgment Day.

But there is a much larger problem here, John. These kinds of people refuse to accept any of the truth I tell them because they are at the other end of the ideological extreme. Let me explain.

I'm sure you've heard of "antisemitism." It is commonly defined as an irrational hatred of the Jews. That is, one who despises the Jews simply because they are Jews. This is a serious sin.

Well, let me introduce you to an equally sinful and culturally stigmatizing phenomenon. I call it "philosemitism." Whereas antisemitism is an irrational hatred of the Jews, its counterpart, philosemitism, is an irrational love of the Jews, that is, one who favors the Jews simply because they are Jews, and as a result of such partiality, one shuns, maligns, ignores, or mistreats non-Jews, or just considers them inferior in some way. As such, philosemitism is just as racist as antisemitism, and just as dangerous. It is this sin that many of my detractors are committing. Two of these philosemites, one who was educated in a Christian Zionist institution, even threatened to blackmail me based on some supposed knowledge he had of my personal affairs. These are vicious people.

Philosemitism is a sin simply because Scripture tells us that God is no respecter of persons; that he does not show favoritism to one race over another. With respect to the ethnic groups of "Jew and Gentile," St. Paul informs us that "there is no partiality with God" (Romans 2:11). He says it again in Galatians 3:28 stating that "There is neither Jew nor Greek." In 1 Timothy 5:21 he says: "I charge you before God and Christ Jesus and the elect angels to keep these rules without prejudice, doing nothing out of favoritism." St. Peter said the same in Acts 10. In the context of the Gentile Cornelius receiving God's blessing from Peter the Jew, Peter says in verses 34-35: "I see that God shows no partiality. Rather, in every nation whoever fears him and acts uprightly is acceptable to him." 1 Peter 2:17 tells us to "Honor all men." Although in the Old Testament the Jews had a special relationship with God and were considered the "chosen people," those days are over because the Old Covenant has been revoked due to the sins of the Jews (2Cor 3:6-14; Col. 2:14-15; Eph 2:15; Heb. 7:18; 8:1-13; 10:9). Unfortunately, philosemitism continues today because many religious and political groups have refused to accept these biblical truths, in one form or another. Hence, Jewish racism continues today, and it is a serious sin. I call it "philosemitism," the opposite of antisemitism.

Although the Church has not used the term "philosemitism," its teachings against it are usually under the term "racism." John Paul II summed it up well when he stated the following:

Man's creation by God 'in his own image' confers upon every human person an eminent dignity; it also postulates the fundamental right of every person to be treated as an end in himself or herself, not merely as a means to other ends.

Although the Church has not used the term "philosemitism", its teachings against it are usually under the term "racism". John Paul II summed it up well when he stated the following:

Man's creation by God 'in his own image' confers upon every human person an eminent dignity; it also postulates the fundamental equality of all human beings....Hence every form of discrimination based on race is absolutely unacceptable. (Allocution to UN Special Committee on Apartheid, July 7, 1984).

The pope's Pontifical Commission for Justice and Peace followed with the same:

"Every nation under heaven" was symbolically represented in Jerusalem at Pentecost, the antitype and victory over the dispersion of Babel. As Peter said, when he was called to the house of the pagan, Cornelius, "God has shown me that I should not call any man common or unclean. God shows no partiality." The Church has the sublime vocation of realizing, first of all within herself, the unity of humankind over and above any ethnic, cultural, national, social or other divisions in order to signify precisely that such divisions are now obsolete, having been abolished by the cross of Christ. In doing this, the Church contributes toward promoting the fraternal coexistence of all peoples....Within the Church 'no inequality arising from race or nationality, social condition or sex' should exist." (21)

The same commission expanded on the teaching of Paul in Galatians 3:28:

It is he who had 'made the two into one and broken down the barrier which used to keep them apart, actually destroying in his own person the hostility.' Out of the Jew and the pagan, Christ wanted 'to create one single New Man in himself.' This New Man is the collective name of humanity redeemed by him, with all the diversity of its components, reconciled with God in a single Body which is the Church, through the Cross which killed hostility. In this way, now 'there is no distinction between Greek and Jew, between the circumcised or the uncircumcised, or between barbarian and Scythian, slave and free man.'

The commission is even clearer in the following paragraph:

Christ himself gave the example. The narrow context of Palestine where nearly all his earthly life took place did not give him many opportunities to meet people from another race. However, he accepted all the categories of persons with whom he came into contact. He did not hesitate to spend time with the Samaritans and to refer to them as an example, although they were despised by the Jews, who treated them as heretics. He made all who were marginalized in one way or another benefit from his salvation: the sick, sinners-men and women, prostitutes, publicans, pagans such as the Syro-phenician woman. Only those were left aside who excluded themselves because of their own self-sufficiency, such as certain Pharisees. And he warned us solemnly: we will be judged on the attitude we have toward the stranger or the least of his brothers; for, without our even knowing it, it is Christ himself whom we meet in them. (21)

And finally:

No human group, however, can boast of having a natural superiority over others, or of exercising any discrimination that affects the basic rights of the person. (23)

Generally, philosemites will not allow or disseminate any criticism of the Jews, regardless if the information brought forth is true and can be proven. If they cannot counter the information, the next step is to personally attack or discredit the messenger.

Philosemites originate from certain ethnic or ideological groups. Obviously, many Jews with Jewish political and religious aspirations are philosemites (Abe Foxman, Rabbi David Rosen, David Klinghoffer, et al.), although there are some Jews who are not classed in that category today (e.g., Israel Shamir and Israel Shahak, who, incidentally, are called "self-hating" Jews by philosemites).

Then there are philosemites based on Protestant religious beliefs (e.g., Dispensationalists and Pentecostals such as Pat Robertson, John Hagee, Hal Lindsey, Ralph Reed, Franklin Graham, Gary Bauer, Joyce Meyer, to name a few). There are also various Catholics I would place in this category, such as Roy Schoeman, Steve Ray, Eugene Fisher, John Pawlikowski and many more.

These people believe, based on their idiosyncratic interpretations of Scripture, that God favors the Jews above other people. In this group, Roy Schoeman is probably one of the better examples of Catholic philosemitism. In his books and website he makes several blatant remarks that favor the Jews above all other people, such as:

- "the Jews are blessed by nature" (Salvation is from the Jews, (SIFTJ) p. 42);
- Ishmael was the "illegitimate son" of Abraham, concluding from this that present-day Arabs, because they come from Ishmael's bastard seed, are "doing a good job" of fulfilling the description of people who "have their hand against every man," and this is "borne out of the fact that in most of the violent conflicts throughout the world...one side is fighting in the name of Islam...as the sons of Ishmael" (SIFTJ, pp. 301-302);
- that Jewish converts have been endowed with a special "Jewish charisma" from God such that they are analogous to "yeast" that makes bread rise (SIFTJ, p. 71);
- that Old Testament prophecy predicts a "new Jewish state," which "shall be extremely prosperous" and that the modern-day Israeli army is a God-favored entity such that God will see to it that "Israel will be miraculously militarily strong and able to defend itself" (SIFTJ, pp. 309-310);
- the "one day" mentioned in Isaiah 66:8 is prophesying the establishment of the nation state of Israel on precisely one day, namely, May 14, 1948 (SIFTJ, p. 307);
- the "fullness of the Gentiles" (Rm 11:25) occurred in 1967, and the sign of its fulfillment was what he deems as the God-blessed six-day surge of the Israeli army against its Arab neighbors in which "Jerusalem...was recaptured by the modern state of Israel in the 1967 war" (SIFTJ, p. 306);
- "...the Catholic Church is nothing but post-messianic Judaism." (EWTN interview);

Third, philosemites come from political strains, such as liberal Democrats and Neo-conservative Republicans (Neo-cons). For example, Bill Clinton's Democratic cabinet was composed entirely of Jews and Jewish sympathizers, as was George Bush's Republican cabinet.

Third, philosemites come from political strains, such as liberal Democrats and Neo-conservative Republicans (Neo-cons). For example, Bill Clinton's Democratic cabinet was composed entirely of Jews and Jewish sympathizers, as was George Bush's Republican cabinet. It is these same Neo-cons who make a practice of favoring the Jews while shunning and accusing Arabs. To these kinds of imperialistic groups, Pius XI spoke appropriately in *Quadragesimo Anno*:

The ultimate consequences of the individualist spirit in economic life are those which you yourselves, Venerable Brethren and Beloved Children, see and deplore: Free competition has destroyed itself; economic dictatorship has supplanted the free market; unbridled ambition for power has likewise succeeded greed for gain; all economic life has become tragically hard, inexorable, and cruel. To these are to be added the grave evils that have resulted from an intermingling and shameful confusion of the functions and duties of public authority with those of the economic sphere – such as, one of the worst, the virtual degradation of the majesty of the State, which although it ought to sit on high like a queen and supreme arbitress, free from all partiality and intent upon the one common good and justice, is become a slave, surrendered and delivered to the passions and greed of men. And as to international relations, two different streams have issued from the one fountain-head: On the one hand, economic nationalism or even economic imperialism; on the other, a no less deadly and accursed internationalism of finance or international imperialism whose country is where profit is. (#109, 1931)

Likewise, in *Populorum Progressio*, Paul VI stated: "But there are also other obstacles and hindrances keeping human society as it now exists from becoming more equitable and from being more firmly and fully based on the solidarity of the human race, they are: nationalism and racism." (62)

In *Pacem in Terris*, John XXIII stated: "First among the rules governing the relations between States is that of truth. This calls, above all, for the elimination of every trace of racism, and the consequent recognition of the principle that all States are by nature equal in dignity." (86)

We hear so much today about the "Catholic-Jewish dialogue." Bishops visit and pray in synagogues (Rhoades, Keeler, Kasper, et al); cardinals write major documents with rabbis promoting Jewish religious concepts (e.g., 2002 *Reflections on Covenant and Missions*); Catholic and Protestant universities hire Jewish teachers who teach Jewish philosophy and morals (e.g., Amy Jill Levine-Vanderbilt; Michael Singer- Notre Dame, et al); Jewish converts, Catholic apologists, universities and major media outlets promote Judaism, the Talmud, and Seder meals (e.g., David Moss, Roy Schoeman, Steve Ray, Ave Maria Univ., EWTN, New York Times, Newsweek, etc.); Catholics and Jews write books and articles together promoting the ecumenical synthesis of Catholicism and Judaism (e.g., 1995 *Toward Greater Understanding*; 2005 *Two Faiths, One Covenant*; *Commonweal*; *America*); attempts are made to restore the Old Covenant for the Jews (USCCB 2002 *Adult Catechism*; 2002 *Reflections* document). The list can go on and on.

But do we see such efforts towards the Muslims as a religion or the Arabs as a people? No, quite the opposite. They are either ignored or demonized. But if these Catholics really want to be faithful to the teachings of Vatican II and John Paul II, then they should be just as diligent to dialogue with Arabs and Muslims as they are with the Jews. If they would, many of the racial and political tensions we experience today would be lessened dramatically. As John Paul II put it in *Tertio Millennio Adveniente*:

On the other hand, as far as the field of religious awareness is concerned, the eve of the Year 2000 will provide a great opportunity, especially in view of the events of recent decades, for inter-religious dialogue, in accordance with the specific guidelines set down by the Second Vatican Council in its Declaration *Nostra Aetate* on the relationship of the Church to non-Christian religions. In this dialogue the Jews and the Muslims ought to have a pre-eminent place. God grant that as a confirmation of these intentions it may also be possible to hold joint meetings in places of significance for the great monotheistic religions. (53)

So why has the dialogue basically been between Catholics and Jews? I believe the answer is philosemitism, a cultural malaise fostered by the semitically-dominated political and religious groups in America. It only makes itself worse when we see that hardly any spiritual progress has been made in the Catholic-Jewish dialogue. We only see the Jews insisting that the New Testament is anti-Semitic, at the same time they seek to convince Catholic prelates that the Mosaic covenant is still valid; that Judaism is a viable religion and pathway to heaven; and that the Jews don't need to convert to Christianity in order to be saved, all of which were promoted in official and unofficial Catholic documents in recent years (e.g., *Reflections on Covenant and Missions*; *The United States Catholic Catechism for Adults*).

Although there is a little variation among them, philosemites generally believe that:

- the Jews are still God's chosen people
- the land of Palestine is for the Jews by divine right
- the Jews are divinely blessed and protected over other nations
- the Jews are more spiritually and mentally gifted than other races of people
- the Jews are closer to God than other races and have a better spiritual pedigree
- the Old Covenant is still valid for the Jews
- Judaism, in one form or another, is still a valid religion
- one can pay homage to a Jewish synagogue but shun a Moslem mosque or Buddhist temple
- the Jews do little if anything to incite criticism or vengeance against them.

Most philosemites will have one or more of these traits, but regardless of the number of similarities among them, they all have what we can call an irrational partiality toward the Jews. If you are vocal about your politics, religion or social mores, philosemites will generally expect you to adopt their philosemitic ways of thinking and acting. If you refuse, they will most likely label you as an "antisemite" and your beliefs as "antisemitic." This is no exaggeration. Abe Foxman, president of the Anti-Defamation League, claims that the New Testament is antisemitic because it accuses the Jews of various sins and involves them in the plot to murder Christ. If the Bible itself is classed an antisemitic, you need not wonder why people who actually criticize Jewish ideas and actions in public today are accused of the same.

In addition to philosemitism, I think it is appropriate to coin an additional word to demonstrate another facet of this current phenomenon

classed an antisemitic, you need not wonder why people who actually criticize Jewish ideas and actions in public today are accused of the same.

In addition to philosemitism, I think it is appropriate to coin an additional word to demonstrate another facet of this current phenomenon. The word is "semitiphobia," that is, "fear of the Jews." There are two things that strongly motivate a man. One is love, the other is fear. Jews who are in power use both of these as psychological tools. If they can't persuade the public to love them more than other races, they will resort to instilling fear in order to force the public to side with them. Hence, alongside many who have an irrational love of the Jews today, there is a whole other group who are deftly afraid of them. They know that the Jews control much of the politics, wealth, academia, media, sciences, arts, and culture today. One would have to be a total recluse, barred from any critical information, not to know the statistics that prove these facts. With this tremendous power, the Jews can ruin a career or a reputation in a matter of seconds. All they need do is brand someone who criticizes them as an "antisemite," publicize it at will in the media which they dominate, and the damage will be practically irreparable. The label of antisemitism strikes more fear in public figures today than the proverbial call from the Internal Revenue Service seeking an audit. The public will rarely ask whether the accused is guilty of the label, for those that pursue such questions will soon find themselves branded as an "antisemite" just for asking the question. The extreme end of this psychological ploy is seen in Germany today where it is a felony against the state to question whether six million Jews were killed by Nazis in World War II. People have actually been jailed simply for raising the issue. Obviously, this law was put in place by powerful Jews in Germany, for the Jews have been migrating to Germany for many years. No other of the dozen or so ethnic or racial groups who were killed by the Nazis are even remembered, much less protected from questioning whether their dead are accurately calculated. So, I think it goes without saying that semitiphobia is just as strong today as philosemitism.

As for the issue with my bishop, I refer you to a paper written by Fr. Brian Harrison, S.T.D., a well-respected and admired priest and scholar. Fr. Harrison analyzed the allegations of my accusers and concluded that they simply don't have a case. They have misconstrued the facts, left out important information, and have basically discredited themselves by engaging in the sin of calumny. Fr. Harrison volunteered to write the paper; I did not ask him. He was simply appalled at the sinful treatment I was receiving from professed Catholics and did what he could to put a stop to it. Unfortunately, they only ratcheted up their calumny even more and disregarded what Fr. Harrison said. You can read the defense at this address:

(<http://www.catholicintl.com/articles/Harrisburg%20letter%20about%20Rhoades.pdf>)

As for my detractors, I simply have nothing to do with them any longer. I leave them in the hands of God. Meanwhile, I continue to do the work that God has given me.

God be with you.

Robert Sungenis

- [5:06 PM](#)
- [374 Views](#)
- [18 eProps](#)
- [21 Comments](#)

- **recommend**
- **recs 0**
- **share**

- **email**
- **sent 0**

- [« newer](#)
- [bellarmineforum's weblog](#)
- [older »](#)

Comments (21)

•

Could BTF please stop with the conspiracy track? Mr. Sungenis brought this on himself, it would be refreshing if he faced it straight up rather than deflecting the blame to everyone else.

Calling Jews an "infection" is well beyond the pale. Saying they're "excised wherever they go" is well beyond the pale. Blaming Jews for sending in Monica Lewinsky to bring Clinton down is paranoid wackiness. Not apologizing for and taking back a blatantly false quote of Jewish convert Shoeman straight up and clearing him is wrong. Slandering a bishop without any real evidence is evil. Saying the bishop is paying homage to Jews because they probably own the mortgages on his diocesan property? Wow. Saying Jews are slave masters? Wow.

Here's that article at BTF (slave masters and mortgages): <http://www.catholicintl.com/articles/>

Answer%20to%20Shea%20on

%20Jones%20book.pdf

How will "context" will save him from those things?

Mr. Sungenis plagiarized white supremacists, Nazis and other anti-Semites. There's an article at BTF right now that has this plagiarized stuff in it. Here's an article proving it:
<http://sungenisandthejews.blogspot.com/2009/07/lies-plagiarism-and-anti-semites.html>

If these guys are wrong, then prove it.

It would be refreshing if Mr. Sungenis would finally take full responsibility for what he's done and written rather than shifting blame and acting as if he's a persecuted prophet and that his critics will all be under God's wrath. Please?

If these guys are wrong, then prove it.

It would be refreshing if Mr. Sungenis would finally take full responsibility for what he's done and written rather than shifting blame and acting as if he's a persecuted prophet and that his critics will all be under God's wrath. Please?

Then maybe we could all get back to enjoying the good work he's capable of. Is that really asking too much?

- [8/25/2009 4:49 PM](#)
- [JMTravers \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

With all due respect to an otherwise very good priest, what Fr. Harrison wrote was not his finest moment.

<http://sungenisandthejews.blogspot.com/2008/09/fr-harrison-and-rsatj.html>

<http://sungenisandthejews.blogspot.com/2008/09/fr-harrison-and-diocese-of-harrisburg.html>

- [8/26/2009 7:47 PM](#)
- [kdsmith \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

Dr Sungenis,

God bless you for all your work and may the Good Lord protect you and your family. I don't always agree with your conclusions, but at least you stand for something and are willing to pay the price for your Catholic convictions. Catholics like you make me proud to be Catholic.

Pina.

- [8/27/2009 2:42 PM](#)
- [GiuNo \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

Robert, I'm personally alarmed at some of the things you seem to be getting into. Not so much the Jewish thing, but I see you've come under the wing of a particularly controversial fellow by the name of E Michael Jones.

Jones is not happy to wait for the official Vatican conclusion to the Medjugorje story. I think he is gaining from the controversy. Worse, he is heavily involved in what could not be called anything better than "persecution" of those involved in the apparitions. Why put your name to such lies as you have there on the front page of your site "E. Michael Jones' The Medjugorje Deception Vindicated by Benedict XVI". On one sentence you have tied Benedict into a verdict he never came to and called everyone involved in Medjugorje a bunch of fraudsters. Do you really think that's right?

- [8/28/2009 9:58 AM](#)
- [paulbaylis \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

I had read your post against Mr. Sungenis, and as far as I can tell you're totally biased by the current ideology of the post-councilor Church. If you claimed to be an honest Catholic, look at the irreproachable facts given by Mr. Sungenis in all his books and articles. As for Mr. Jones his presenting the true behind the scenes, of the current conspiracy against the Church lay down by her enemies. Keep in mind that there remains a Remnant of true Catholics, and are to be persecuted either by the Press or by the power of money which it's at their disposal. Gene546

- [8/28/2009 12:53 PM](#)
- [gene546@revelife \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

@JMTravers -

Could BTF please stop with the conspiracy track? Mr. Sungenis brought this on himself, it would be refreshing if he faced it straight up rather than deflecting the blame to everyone else.

Calling Jews an "infection" is well beyond the pale.

R. Sungenis: This is a boldfaced lie. I never said or wrote that the Jews were an "infection," and would never say that, for I don't believe it. You

R. Sungenis: This is a boldfaced lie. I never said or wrote that the Jews were an “infection,” and would never say that, for I don’t believe it. You got this off a slanderous video made by Paul Tarsax, but you will notice that he provides no source. He made it up. If you disagree, then show the source. If you cannot, then you need to apologize to me.

Saying they're "excised wherever they go" is well beyond the pale.

R. Sungenis: What is “beyond the pale” is you advancing a slanderous calumny without even attempting to substantiate it. As for the statement, “excised wherever they go,” no, it is not beyond the pale because it is quite true. Virtually every country the Jews have lived in, they have been excised. I suggest you read the history before you make false charges. I can recommend a few books in case you want to delve into the issue. In any case, any statement to that effect was taken off our website years ago.

Blaming Jews for sending in Monica Lewinsky to bring Clinton down is paranoid wackiness.

R. Sungenis: Whether true or not, I took that statement off our website years ago. Irrespective of that, the fact remains that the Jews are heavily involved in influencing our government. As I said in my last QA, both the Clinton and the Bush cabinets were made up entirely of Jews and Jewish sympathizers. That is a fact that Americans need to deal with, not slam people for pointing it out.

Not apologizing for and taking back a blatantly false quote of Jewish convert Shoeman straight up and clearing him is wrong.

R. Sungenis: I did apologize. Go read my letter to Schoeman again. It was Schoeman who did not respond to me, and never has. As for Schoeman’s other responsibilities, I suggest you tell him to stop promoting Jewish racism. He has said and maintains, for example, that the Jews are “blessed by nature...even if they don’t accept Jesus Christ.” You should also tell him to stop circumventing Catholic doctrine by his erroneous views of Scripture and history (e.g., that the Church was wrong for 2000 years for teaching supersessionism). THAT should be your major concern, but alas, Mr. Schoeman can say anything he desires and you and your friends won’t say a word of warning to him nor warn Catholics of his errors.

Slandering a bishop without any real evidence is evil. Saying the bishop is paying homage to Jews because they probably own the mortgages on his diocesan property? Wow.

R. Sungenis: I already apologized for that. If you didn’t hear it the first time, I apologize again. I was very angry at that time at Bishop Rhoades. Nevertheless, what should be of more concern to you, however, is that Bishop Rhoades does pay homage to Jews by praying with them in their synagogues, the very people who deny the Savior, Jesus Christ, that he is supposed to believe in. You might also confront Bishop Rhoades for promoting the heretical belief that the Mosaic covenant is still valid for the Jews, and never retracting that heresy when he had the opportunity to do so. I know, because I wrote to him and asked him and his vicar general, Fr. King, to forsake their anti-supersessionist views. Here is some breaking news for you. My letter to Rhoades and King was prompted by an email from King that he wrote to all the priests of the Harrisburg diocese on July 15, 2008, an email which was eventually sent to me by a friend of one of the priests. In the email Fr. King stated:

“Dr. Robert Sungenis...personal opinions...including...supercession [sic] of the Old Testament Covenant, stand apart from (and in discord with) authentic Catholic teaching on these subjects.”

I have the original email and I can make it public if I need to. When I sent it to Rhoades and King and asked them to stop defaming me to the rest of the diocese, and also asked them to forsake their anti-supersessionist views that were contained in the email, Fr. King responded by saying he wasn’t going to respond.

So there you have it. The bishop and the vicar general of my diocese are teaching heretical doctrines to the priests under their care, and defaming me in the process and refusing to do anything to remedy the situation. In brief, the whole controversy with Bishop Rhoades occurred when he and his vicar general tried to force me to adopt their heresy and I refused.

Saying Jews are slave masters? Wow.

Here's that article at BTF (slave masters and mortgages): <http://www.catholicintl.com/articles/>

Here's that article at BTF (slave masters and mortgages): <http://www.catholicintl.com/articles/>

Answer%20to%20Shea%20on%20Jones%20book.pdf

How will "context" will save him from those things?

R. Sungenis: I suggest you go re-read the context. It concerns how the Jews are trying to influence our Catholic prelature by using political power, financial power and mostly the threat of antisemitism if they don't succumb to Jewish desires. It's the same ploy that Abe Foxman tried to use on the pope when the pope retained the Latin Mass prayer for the conversion of the Jews. He told the world that the Church was being "antisemitic." When the Jews force you to do their bidding by threatening you with the label of antisemitism, then they have indeed become "slave masters." But I didn't hear any criticism of Foxman from you or your friends

Mr. Sungenis plagiarized white supremacists, Nazis and other anti-Semites.

R. Sungenis: False, and this has been cleared up numerous times, but you and your friends continue the calumny. Moreover, these accusations are now seven years old, and all the material that was suspect of your allegations was removed from our site years ago as a gesture of good will.

There's an article at BTF right now that has this plagiarized stuff in it. Here's an article proving it: <http://sungenisandthejews.blogspot.com/2009/07/lies-plagiarism-and-anti-semite.html>

If these guys are wrong, then prove it.

R. Sungenis: That's easy. Tell whoever wrote that slam to go read the redone article before he engages in his calumny. The article was heavily edited before it was re-published. All material that was formerly suspect of what you deem as "plagiarism" was removed. The only issues that are covered in the present re-published article are theological issues concerning the Jews. I suggest you go read it, for they tell how our Catholic prelature was taken in by Jewish rabbis seeking to undermine the Catholic faith.

It would be refreshing if Mr. Sungenis would finally take full responsibility for what he's done and written rather than shifting blame and acting as if he's a persecuted prophet and that his critics will all be under God's wrath. Please?

Then maybe we could all get back to enjoying the good work he's capable of. Is that really asking too much?

R. Sungenis: I already apologized for what needed to have an apology, and if there are any apologies I missed, I will be glad to apologize for them as well. Perhaps you didn't hear or read about the previous apologies, but that doesn't surprise me, since many of the statements I make are selectively published by my opponents. And, as I said above, the material you cite was removed from our website as a measure of good will years ago, but you and your friends keep bringing them up. That sounds like an agenda to me.

As for my work, I continue to do "good work" despite the attacks by my opponents. I was the one who single-handedly pressured the USCCB to remove the heretical sentence on page 131 of the *United States Catholic Catechism for Adults*, since NO OTHER Catholic apologist, priest or other lay person even noticed the error, much less sought to have it corrected. In fact, there was even one Catholic who worked for CUF who claimed that I shouldn't be credited with the removal of the sentence on page 131 since, as he put it, there were other reviewers who had edited the catechism long before Robert Sungenis came along. This shows how desperate my enemies are to denounce me. Stop and think for a moment. If "other reviewers" edited the catechism, then why did they leave the erroneous sentence on page 131? Not very good reviewers, are they? Or let's say that the reviewers pointed out the error on page 131. This means that the USCCB ignored their recommendation and published the catechism knowing that it contained a heretical statement. Either way, CUF's argument is shot down and I was vindicated, but no one at CUF or anywhere else ever admitted it. As it stands, yes, it was me, the "persecuted prophet," as you put it, that stood alone when every single Catholic with any kind of clout ran like scared rabbits away from the issue, or, decided that they would attack me on other issues so as to deflect credit for what I was doing to save the US catechism from heresy.

I was also the one who spearheaded the critique of the *Reflections on Covenant and Missions* document in 2002. I wrote the most detailed exposé of its erroneous concepts. Now, seven years later, a committee of the USCCB finally recognized that all was not well with the *Reflections* document and proceeded to write a critique of its major tenets, published just last month. Interestingly enough, the Jews who were previously threatening their "antisemitic" label against Catholics who did not go along with their agenda, have now come out and stated just last week that future dialogue with the Catholic Church is terminated because of the USCCB committee's critique of the *Reflections* document. But do I get any commendations from you or your friends for this? No, I'm still facing silly allegations of "plagiarizing" material that happened seven years ago.

threatening their “antisemitic” label against Catholics who did not go along with their agenda, have now come out and stated just last week that future dialogue with the Catholic Church is terminated because of the USCCB committee’s critique of the *Reflections* document. But do I get any commendations from you or your friends for this? No, I’m still facing silly allegations of “plagiarizing” material that happened seven years ago, even though explanations and apologies were given for whatever was written, and even though the republished essay I wrote against *Reflections* was excised of any of the offending material. So this is simply another case of ‘damned if you do, and damned if you don’t’ for Robert Sungenis. I know how the game is played. I wasn’t born yesterday.

The real problem is that no other Catholic apologist wants to take on the Jews. They are all afraid of having their careers nosedive; of being called an “antisemite”; of having the same thing done to them that was done to me by the Jewish ideologues in Catholicism. I’ve seen the blogs. Any negative comments about the Jews or Judaism, whether true or not, are always shot down, and if the blogger persists, he will be banned. Either that or, as I said in my recent answer to John D. in the QA, Catholic philosemites refuse to say anything negative about the Jews and their anti-Catholic designs no matter what evil things the Jews do, nor do they allow others to say anything negative. Instead, they allow secular Jews to say and do whatever they want in politics and culture; and they allow Jewish converts such as Roy Schoeman and David Moss to teach all kinds of erroneous theology and say racist remarks favoring the Jews. None of you will say anything to stop this breach of the Catholic faith. Instead, you calumniate me for even bringing up these issues for discussion!

So, bottom line? You and your friends admit the calumny you have perpetrated against me, and acknowledge that certain Catholic prelates, certain Catholics organizations and certain Catholic converts are teaching erroneous things about the Catholic faith and that we have a responsibility to expose them. In turn, I will be glad to apologize for anything you and your friends find offensive that I have said or written; and I will be glad to remove anything that is offensive (as long as it is not theological material). If we can both agree to these things, then perhaps we can all get back to the business of saving souls, especially Jewish souls.

Talk to your friends and let me know your decision. You can reach me at cairoomeo@aol.com

God be with you.

Robert Sungenis

- [8/28/2009 2:28 PM](#)
- [bellarmineforum](#) (message)
- [reply](#)

Sungenis, I see you defending yourself vigorously against what you feel as unfair criticism, conspiracy theory and downright lie. Once I would have felt sorry for you. But, to know that you are a supporter of E Michael Jones, who indulges in exactly this same unfair criticism, calumny and lie against the priest and visionaries of Medjugorje, all I can think of is "It serves you right". Get yourself clean. Distance yourself from wolves like Jones.

- [8/28/2009 5:00 PM](#)
- [paulbaylis](#) (message)
- [reply](#)

Robert, please stop given apologies to this people. What they’re looking for is to make you apologize for ever for the things you rightly said about the powerful influence of the Zionist movement in America. Don’t waste your time. Enough of that, and continue with your ministry. I can take on them myself if they would like to debate about any single issue involving the dogma of the Catholic Church. Gene546

- [8/29/2009 11:30 AM](#)
- [gene546](#) (message)
- [reply](#)

I’d like to be sympathetic based on your past work, but your answer’s kind of ridiculous, Mr. Sungenis.

First you said it’s a boldfaced lie that you called Jews an infection. Some guy just totally made that up on a video?

"the Jewish element has so infected our Catholic Church today that they have turned Catholics into Jewish apologists." Robert Sungenis

<http://web.archive.org/web/20070326171210/http://www.catholicintl.com/qa/qa.htm#Question+33>

Do you have any idea how closely that tracks with Nazi terms about Jews? Hitler and the Nazis called Jews a parasitic infection. <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/sprech44a.htm>

You said they have infected our Church. Wow. It’s completely offensive to even use such a word in regard to ANY human beings, but especially Jews after what happened to them. Don’t you get that?

Then, after complaining that you don’t see Jews as an infection, you came right back and stood by your statement that Jews are “excised” wherever they go? Hello? Are you serious? Here’s the whole of what you said: “every place that [the Jews] have been throughout history, they have been excised. Because they do the same thing every time they go in there, they try to take over places that they go to! And every time they do, people get wise to it, just we’re doing now, and they get themselves in trouble. And then they wonder why they’re so persecuted, and vagabonds across the face of the earth for the last 2,000 years – well this is why!”

have been excised. Because they do the same thing every time they go in there, they try to take over places that they go to. And every time they do, people get wise to it, just we're doing now, and they get themselves in trouble. And then they wonder why they're so persecuted, and vagabonds across the face of the earth for the last 2,000 years – well this is why!”

Every place, just like Nazi Germany, Mr. Sungenis? Is that why the Jews were “excised” in the Holocaust? Because “people got wise” to them? You know. It was their fault, right?

And your choice of words just reinforces that you see Jews as an infection. We talk about TUMORS and PARASITES being excised, Mr. Sungenis, not human beings. I really have to explain that? Human beings are attacked, persecuted, killed, murdered, expelled. So, sure, your choice of words also reveals contempt for Jews.

As for the plagiarism, you didn't read the article I gave the link to. It isn't about your old article. It's about the redone article on your website right now. There's still plagiarism in it right now (and other things that are out of line). As for Mr. Shocman, you'll have to show me your apology because I can't find it. This article sums up the last I read of where things stood with you and him: <http://www.pugiofidei.com/fraud.htm>.

About the rest of your answer, I have to basically agree with Paul Baylis. Although I don't take a stand one way or the other on Medugorje (I've seen good and bad), I think you're following E. Michael Jones and all the conspiracy paranoia too much. And I don't know if even Jones thinks that NASA uses lasers to make crop circles just to control us and turn people away from the Bible and Christ, like you wrote a little while back: <http://bellarmineforum.xanga.com/702646935/question-139---what-do-you-think-of-ufos/>

I haven't read much from him, but does he get into that kind of wacky paranoia? Does he believe the Jews sent in Monica Lewinsky to take Bill Clinton down? Does he believe Jews are controlling our phone lines like you do? Maybe he does but I haven't seen it.

I can't figure out for the life of me how you believe all of this is helping anyone (nevermind Jews!) come to Jesus Christ. Maybe you're trying too hard to be a hero or something for everyone to follow, I don't know. And now you have your back up and are going to prove everyone wrong and you don't care how you do it?

I think most people who remember your better days are kind of hoping for a return of the “Not By” Robert Sungenis. It's too bad that he's been abducted by aliens (or Jews?). LOL Joking!

Peace.

- [8/29/2009 9:20 PM](#)
- [JMTravers \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

• [@JMTravers](#) -

If you don't believe what Robert has put it about the Influence of Zionism in America, and in the Catholic Church; I will like to recommend to you two Books: “Guilt by Association,” and the Books of Viconte Poncins de Leon; and if you think these books are too biased read the “Encyclopedia Judaica” of 1966. Gene546

- [8/30/2009 12:38 PM](#)
- [gene546 \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

• Listen, I've read so much of this its coming out of my nose, okay? But I'm here shaking my head from what I'm reading. You're insulting my intelligence and everyone else who was crazy enough to follow all of his crap. Can we be real for a change, okay?

For years your going on posting all this Jew bashing crap and finally your bishop had enough and you get a letter from him telling you to knock it off and what do you do, great obedient Catholic? You go on for another whole month posting more of it. So then on July 27th, 2007 you were called in to meet with your bishop about all your Jewish attacks. A few days after that you wrote “CAI and Its Teachings on the Jews.” All of a sudden your meek as a lamb, right? And you went on and on about how great Bishop Rhoades was, okay? Here's what you wrote:

“I take their wisdom and counsel with the utmost seriousness and consider their direction as if it was from God himself. I consider it an honor not only to be a member of the Catholic Church but also to be under the vigilance of such wise and caring pastors. In short, I consider it a privilege to obey them.... Since he acts in God's stead, we will do our utmost to please him so as to preserve the peace and tranquility he so desires to maintain in the body of Christ.” ~ Robert Sungenis

Now, that's very beautiful, okay? Sounds very Catholic!

But then in January 2008 you wrote Old Covenant Revoked or Not Revoked and you said something totally different about the same friggin meeting:

“I knew upon leaving the building the erroneous theology [Fr. King], Rhoades and the USCCB were attempting to propagate to unsuspecting Catholics.” ~ Robert Sungenis

www.catholicintl.com/artic

les/The%20Old%20Covenant%2

0Revoked%20or%20Not%20Revo

ked%20for%20Culture%20Wars

.pdf

So, are we supposed to believe you thought your bishop was acting in God's stead while he was putting over this horrible heresy on poor Catholics? Come on. Even you couldn't ask us to believe that! So you know were lying one time or the other. And seeing you were so angry at your bishop in the second article, it's not too hard to guess which time you lied, okay? Either that, or you basically sold out when you wrote the first article to just get the bishop's blessing or get out of dutch. So either way, you don't come out looking too good, okay?

And what about this? You told your friend Suter in an email on August 5, 2007 that you had to obey your bishop and take down your Jewish crap because he put you under an interdict.

"The fact is that I was under an interdict from my bishop. I had no choice unless I decided to directly disobey him." R. Sungenis

The next day, you were writing to Forrest (whose NOT a friend) that your bishop didn't make you do anything. You were doing it out of the goodness of your heart, being an obedient Catholic and all, right?

"I specifically stated in my recent posting that Bishop Rhoades did not conclude that I had to remove all the Jewish material from my website... As I specified in the above posting, I voluntarily took down the material... Why is it that you went against what my bishop concluded by claiming that the bishop demanded I remove the material, when, in fact, I stated that he did not do so?" "[The bishop] only asked that I would be more careful in my writing on the Jews...there is nothing more he requested." ~ Robert Sungenis

http://sungenisandthejews.blogspot.com/2008/03/by-sungenis-alone_29.html#thirteen

So you lied again, okay? Either you were pressured and forced by your bishop to stop attacking Jews or you weren't. Then to keep lying about your bishop? Are you kidding me? Then all the wa wa wa about Oh, they're out to get me, it's a conspiracy! Everything's a conspiracy to you for crying out loud, especially if you think those scary Jews are anywhere! Booga-booga! You really have brass ones, buddy. But you're not fooling anyone who isn't drinking your Kool-aide. Your bishop has my sympathies. Grow up.

Alex Pappas

- [8/31/2009 4:14 AM](#)
- [AlexPappas \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

•

[@gene546](#) -

Robert, please stop given apologies to this people. What they're looking for is to make you apologize for ever for the things you rightly said about the powerful influence of the Zionist movement in America. Don't waste your time. Enough of that, and continue with your ministry. I can take on them myself if they would like to debate about any single issue involving the dogma of the Catholic Church. Gene546

8/29/2009 11:30 AM gene546 (message) reply

6/27/2007 11:50 AM gene40 (message) reply

R. Sungenis: Thank you, Gene. I'll be glad to have you share the mantel with me.

I'd like to be sympathetic based on your past work, but your answer's kind of ridiculous, Mr. Sungenis. First you said it's a boldfaced lie that you called Jews an infection. Some guy just totally made that up on a video? "the Jewish element has so infected our Catholic Church today that they have turned Catholics into Jewish apologists." Robert Sungenis <http://web.archive.org/web/20070326171210/http://www.catholicintl.com/qa/qa.htm#Question+33>

Do you have any idea how closely that tracks with Nazi terms about Jews? Hitler and the Nazis called Jews a parasitic infection. <http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/sprech44a.htm>

You said they have infected our Church. Wow. It's completely offensive to even use such a word in regard to ANY human beings, but especially Jews after what happened to them. Don't you get that?

R. Sungenis: This either shows how devious and deceptive you and your ilk are, or perhaps you are simply so biased that you can't admit the difference between a verb and a noun. To say that someone or something has "infected" (verb) our Church does not mean that the Jewish people, at large, are an "infection" (noun). My gosh, where did you receive your education! Anyone with a fifth grade education can figure what I said and intended to say. The question is: Are you smarter than a fifth grader? END

Then, after complaining that you don't see Jews as an infection, you came right back and stood by your statement that Jews are "excised" wherever they go? Hello? Are you serious? Here's the whole of what you said: "every place that [the Jews] have been throughout history, they have been excised. Because they do the same thing every time they go in there, they try to take over places that they go to! And every time they do, people get wise to it, just we're doing now, and they get themselves in trouble. And then they wonder why they're so persecuted, and vagabonds across the face of the earth for the last 2,000 years – well this is why!"

R. Sungenis: You didn't take my previous advice. I told you to go read the history books on the Jews' experience in other countries. As a matter of fact, you can start with the Old Testament. God Himself "excised" the Jews for the same sins that I have complained about for the last seven years. First he "excised" the northern 10 tribes. Then he "excised" the two southern tribes. Unfortunately, God hasn't stopped, since every country they have been in the same thing occurs, and for the same reasons. I suggest you stop blaming it on the nation who excised them and start looking at what the Jewish people do to get themselves excised. Use the Old Testament as your paradigm, and you'll begin to see the truth.

Again, your basic problem is that you always think the Jews are innocent and do nothing to incite retribution against them. First, go read the Old Testament and find out who you are dealing with. Or are you also going to blame God for reporting that he excised the Jews for their sins? If not, then don't blame me for reporting that the Jews continued to be excised from every nation they lived in for the same sins they committed in the Old Testament. If you want to read how blind the Jews are to their own sins that get them excised, I suggest you read my critique of Jewish author David Klinghoffer's book "Why the Jews Rejected Jesus" (http://www.catholicintl.com/bookreviews/A_Review_of_David_Klinghoffer.pdf). In all his 210 pages, Klinghoffer doesn't admit one sin the Jews have committed, either in the Old Testament or in our day. Oh, and by the way, Klinghoffer told me that he refuses to read my critique. Par for the course. END

Every place, just like Nazi Germany, Mr. Sungenis? Is that why the Jews were "excised" in the Holocaust? Because "people got wise" to them? You know. It was their fault, right?

R. Sungenis: I suggest you read the unsanitized accounts of what really happened. When the Jews and Jewish sympathizers start showing proof that the Nazis killed 6 million Jews by gassing them, instead of jailing people for even bringing up the question, then you can talk about the Nazis and I'll listen. Until then, you're only begging the question and engaging in the usual demagoguery. The Red Cross documents in verifiable records at anyone's disposal that there were only a few hundred thousand Jews who lost their lives in the German camps, and most of those were due to disease. So, at the least, there is conflicting evidence and it demands that a thorough investigation be performed, and by someone other than the Jews. Unfortunately, the audacity of German Jews to jail someone for merely asking for an investigation doesn't seem to bother you or your sympathizers.

As for Germany's relationship with the Jews, well, the Germans treated the Jews very nicely when the Jews were excised out of Russia and migrated to Germany. Then the Jews turned on the Germans because they got a better deal from someone else. Better yet, I'll let a Jew tell you what happened. He's much better at it than I am.

For Germany's relationship with the Jews, when the Germans treated the Jews very nicely when the Jews were chased out of Russia and migrated to Germany. Then the Jews turned on the Germans because they got a better deal from someone else. Better yet, I'll let a Jew tell you what happened. He's much better at it than I am.

His name is Benjamin Freedman. He was born in 1890 and was a successful Jewish businessman in New York City. He left organized Jewry in 1945 and spent the rest of his life and money exposing the Jewish takeover of the United States. Freedman was a mover and shaker at the highest levels of Jewish organizations. He knew Bernard Baruch, Samuel Untermyer, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, Joseph Kennedy, and John F. Kennedy, and many more.

Here's his firsthand account:

Now, you say, 'well, that's a very broad statement to make', but let me show what happened while you were -- I don't want to wear that out --- let me show what happened while WE were all asleep. I'm including myself with you. We were all asleep. What happened?

World War I broke out in the summer of 1914. Nineteen-hundred and fourteen was the year in which World War One broke out. There are few people here my age who remember that. Now that war was waged on one side by Great Britain, France, and Russia; and on the other side by Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey. What happened?

Within two years Germany had won that war: not alone won it nominally, but won it actually. The German submarines, which were a surprise to the world, had swept all the convoys from the Atlantic Ocean, and Great Britain stood there without ammunition for her soldiers, stood there with one week's food supply facing her -- and after that, starvation.

At that time, the French army had mutinied. They lost 600,000 of the flower of French youth in the defense of Verdun on the Somme. The Russian army was defecting. They were picking up their toys and going home, they didn't want to play war anymore, they didn't like the Czar. And the Italian army had collapsed.

Now Germany -- not a shot had been fired on the German soil. Not an enemy soldier had crossed the border into Germany. And yet, here was Germany offering England peace terms. They offered England a negotiated peace on what the lawyers call a status quo ante basis. That means: "Let's call the war off, and let everything be as it was before the war started."

Well, England, in the summer of 1916 was considering that. Seriously! They had no choice. It was either accepting this negotiated peace that Germany was magnanimously offering them, or going on with the war and being totally defeated.

While that was going on, the Zionists in Germany, who represented the Zionists from Eastern Europe, went to the British War Cabinet and -- I am going to be brief because this is a long story, but I have all the documents to prove any statement that I make if anyone here is curious, or doesn't believe what I'm saying is at all possible -- the Zionists in London went to the British war cabinet and they said: "Look here. You can yet win this war. You don't have to give up. You don't have to accept the negotiated peace offered to you now by Germany. You can win this war if the United States will come in as your ally."

The United States was not in the war at that time. We were fresh; we were young; we were rich; we were powerful. They [Zionists] told England: "We will guarantee to bring the United States into the war as your ally, to fight with you on your side, if you will promise us Palestine after you win the war."

In other words, they made this deal: "We will get the United States into this war as your ally. The price you must pay us is Palestine after you have won the war and defeated Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey."

Now England had as much right to promise Palestine to anybody, as the United States would have to promise Japan to Ireland for any reason whatsoever. It's absolutely absurd that Great Britain -- that never had any connection or any interest or any right in what is known as Palestine -- should offer it as coin of the realm to pay the Zionists for bringing the United States into the war.

However, they made that promise, in October of 1916. October, nineteen hundred and sixteen. And shortly after that -- I don't know how many here remember it -- the United States, which was almost totally pro-German -- totally pro-German -- because the newspapers here were controlled by Jews, the bankers were Jews, all the media of mass communications in this country were controlled by Jews, and they were pro-German because their people, in the majority of cases came from Germany, and they wanted to see Germany lick the Czar.

controlled by Jews, the bankers were Jews, all the media or mass communications in this country were controlled by Jews, and they were pro-German because their people, in the majority of cases came from Germany, and they wanted to see Germany lick the Czar.

The Jews didn't like the Czar, and they didn't want Russia to win this war. So the German bankers -- the German-Jews -- Kuhn Loeb and the other big banking firms in the United States refused to finance France or England to the extent of one dollar. They stood aside and they said: "As long as France and England are tied up with Russia, not one cent!" But they poured money into Germany, they fought with Germany against Russia, trying to lick the Czarist regime.

Now those same Jews, when they saw the possibility of getting Palestine, they went to England and they made this deal. At that time, everything changed, like the traffic light that changes from red to green. Where the newspapers had been all pro-German, where they'd been telling the people of the difficulties that Germany was having fighting Great Britain commercially and in other respects, all of a sudden the Germans were no good. They were villains. They were Huns. They were shooting Red Cross nurses. They were cutting off babies' hands. And they were no good.

Well, shortly after that, Mr. Wilson declared war on Germany.

The Zionists in London sent these cables to the United States, to Justice Brandeis: "Go to work on President Wilson. We're getting from England what we want. Now you go to work, and you go to work on President Wilson and get the United States into the war." And that did happen. That's how the United States got into the war. We had no more interest in it; we had no more right to be in it than we have to be on the moon tonight instead of in this room.

Now the war -- World War One -- in which the United States participated had absolutely no reason to be our war. We went in there -- we were railroaded into it -- if I can be vulgar, we were suckered into -- that war merely so that the Zionists of the world could obtain Palestine. Now, that is something that the people in the United States have never been told. They never knew why we went into World War One. Now, what happened?

After we got into the war, the Zionists went to Great Britain and they said: "Well, we performed our part of the agreement. Let's have something in writing that shows that you are going to keep your bargain and give us Palestine after you win the war." Because they didn't know whether the war would last another year or another ten years. So they started to work out a receipt. The receipt took the form of a letter, and it was worded in very cryptic language so that the world at large wouldn't know what it was all about. And that was called the Balfour Declaration.

The Balfour Declaration was merely Great Britain's promise to pay the Zionists what they had agreed upon as a consideration for getting the United States into the war. So this great Balfour Declaration, that you hear so much about, is just as phony as a three dollar bill. And I don't think I could make it more emphatic than that.

Now, that is where all the trouble started. The United States went in the war. The United States crushed Germany. We went in there, and it's history. You know what happened. Now, when the war was ended, and the Germans went to Paris, to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919, there were 117 Jews there, as a delegation representing the Jews, headed by Bernard Baruch. I was there: I ought to know. Now what happened?

The Jews at that peace conference, when they were cutting up Germany and parceling out Europe to all these nations that claimed a right to a certain part of European territory, the Jews said, "How about Palestine for us?" And they produced, for the first time to the knowledge of the Germans, this Balfour Declaration. So the Germans, for the first time realized, "Oh, that was the game! That's why the United States came into the war." And the Germans for the first time realized that they were defeated, they suffered this terrific reparation that was slapped onto them, because the Zionists wanted Palestine and they were determined to get it at any cost.

Now, that brings us to another very interesting point. When the Germans realized this, they naturally resented it. Up to that time, the Jews had never been better off in any country in the world than they had been in Germany.

You had Mr. Rathenau there, who was maybe 100 times as important in industry and finance as is Bernard Baruch in this country. You had Mr. Balin, who owned the two big steamship lines, the North German Lloyd's and the Hamburg-American Lines. You had Mr. Bleichroder, who was the banker for the Hohenzollern family. You had the Warburgs in Hamburg, who were the big merchant bankers -- the biggest in the world. The Jews were doing very well in Germany. No question about that. Now, the Germans felt: "Well, that was quite a sellout."

It was a sellout that I can best compare -- suppose the United States was at war today with the Soviet Union. And we were winning. And we told the Soviet Union: "Well, let's quit. We offer you peace terms. Let's forget the whole thing." And all of a sudden Red China came into the war as an ally of the Soviet Union. And throwing them into the war brought about our defeat. A crushing defeat, with reparations the likes of which man's imagination cannot encompass.

told the Soviet Union: "Well, let's quit. We offer you peace terms. Let's forget the whole thing." And all of a sudden Red China came into the war as an ally of the Soviet Union. And throwing them into the war brought about our defeat. A crushing defeat, with reparations the likes of which man's imagination cannot encompass.

Imagine, then, after that defeat, if we found out that it was the Chinese in this country, our Chinese citizens, who all the time we thought they were loyal citizens working with us, were selling us out to the Soviet Union and that it was through them that Red China was brought into the war against us. How would we feel, in the United States against Chinese? I don't think that one of them would dare show his face on any street. There wouldn't be lampposts enough, convenient, to take care of them. Imagine how we would feel.

Well, that's how the Germans felt towards these Jews. "We've been so nice to them"; and from 1905 on, when the first Communist revolution in Russia failed, and the Jews had to scramble out of Russia, they all went to Germany. And Germany gave them refuge. And they were treated very nicely. And here they sold Germany down the river for no reason at all other than they wanted Palestine as a so-called "Jewish commonwealth."

Now, Nahum Sokolow -- all the great leaders, the big names that you read about in connection with Zionism today -- they, in 1919, 1920, '21, '22, and '23, they wrote in all their papers -- and the press was filled with their statements -- that "the feeling against the Jews in Germany is due to the fact that they realized that this great defeat was brought about by our intercession and bringing the United States into the war against them."

The Jews themselves admitted that. It wasn't that the Germans in 1919 discovered that a glass of Jewish blood tasted better than Coca-Cola or Muenschner Beer. There was no religious feeling. There was no sentiment against those people merely on account of their religious belief. It was all political. It was economic. It was anything but religious.

Nobody cared in Germany whether a Jew went home and pulled down the shades and said "Shema' Yisrael" or "Our Father." No one cared in Germany any more than they do in the United States. Now this feeling that developed later in Germany was due to one thing: that the Germans held the Jews responsible for their crushing defeat, for no reason at all, because World War One was started against Germany for no reason for which they [Germans] were responsible. They were guilty of nothing. Only of being successful. They built up a big navy. They built up world trade.

You must remember, Germany, at the time of Napoleon, at the time of the French Revolution, what was the German Reich consisted of 300 -- three hundred! -- small city-states, principalities, dukedoms, and so forth. Three hundred little separate political entities. And between that time, between the period of . . . between Napoleon and Bismarck, they were consolidated into one state. And within 50 years after that time they became one of the world's great powers. Their navy was rivalling Great Britain's, they were doing business all over the world, they could undersell anybody and make better products. And what happened? What happened as a result of that?

There was a conspiracy between England, France, and Russia that: "We must slap down Germany", because there isn't one historian in the world that can find a valid reason why those three countries decided to wipe Germany off the map politically. Now, what happened after that?

When Germany realized that the Jews were responsible for her defeat, they naturally resented it. But not a hair on the head of any Jew was harmed. Not a single hair. Professor Tansill, of Georgetown University, who had access to all the secret papers of the State Department, wrote in his book, and quoted from a State Department document written by Hugo Schoenfelt, a Jew who Cordell Hull sent to Europe in 1933 to investigate the so-called camps of political prisoners. And he wrote back that he found them in very fine condition.

They were in excellent shape; everybody treated well. And they were filled with Communists. Well, a lot of them were Jews, because the Jews happened to be maybe 98 per cent of the Communists in Europe at that time. And there were some priests there, and ministers, and labor leaders, Masons, and others who had international affiliations.

Now, the Jews sort of tried to keep the lid on this fact. They didn't want the world to really understand that they had sold out Germany, and that the Germans resented that.

So they did take appropriate action against them [against the Jews]. They. . . shall I say, discriminated against them wherever they could? They shunned them. The same as we would the Chinese, or the Negroes, or the Catholics, or anyone in this country who had sold us out to an enemy and brought about our defeat.

Now, after a while, the Jews of the world didn't know what to do, so they called a meeting in Amsterdam. Jews from every country in the world attended in July 1933. And they said to Germany: "You fire Hitler! And you put every Jew back into his former position, whether he was a Communist, no matter what he was. You can't treat us that way! And we, the Jews of the world, are calling upon you, and serving this

Now, after a while, the Jews of the world didn't know what to do, so they called a meeting in Amsterdam. Jews from every country in the world attended in July 1933. And they said to Germany: "You fire Hitler! And you put every Jew back into his former position, whether he was a Communist, no matter what he was. You can't treat us that way! And we, the Jews of the world, are calling upon you, and serving this ultimatum upon you." Well, the Germans told them. . . you can imagine. So what did they [the Jews] do?

They broke up, and Samuel Untermyer, if the name means anything to people here. . . (You want to ask a question? --- Uh, there were no Communists in Germany at that time. they were called 'Social Democrats.)

Well, I don't want to go by what they were called. We're now using English words, and what they were called in Germany is not very material. . . but they were Communists, because in 1917, the Communists took over Germany for a few days. Rosa Luxembourg and Karl Liebknecht, and a group of Jews in Germany took over the government for three days. In fact, when the Kaiser ended the war, he fled to Holland because he thought the Communists were going to take over Germany as they did Russia, and that he was going to meet the same fate that the Czar did in Russia. So he left and went to Holland for safety and for security.

Now, at that time, when the Communist threat in Germany was quashed, it was quiet, the Jews were working, still trying to get back into their former -- their status -- and the Germans fought them in every way they could, without hurting a hair on anyone's head. The same as one group, the Prohibitionists, fought the people who were interested in liquor, and they didn't fight one another with pistols, they did it every way they could.

Well, that's the way they were fighting the Jews in Germany. And, at that time, mind you, there were 80 to 90 million Germans and there were only 460,000 Jews. . . less than one half of one percent of Germany were Jews. And yet, they controlled all of the press, they controlled most of the economy, because they had come in and with cheap money -- you know the way the Mark was devalued -- they bought up practically everything.

Well, in 1933 when Germany refused to surrender, mind you, to the World Conference of Jews in Amsterdam, they broke up and Mr. Untermyer came back to the United States -- who was the head of the American delegation and the president of the whole conference -- and he went from the steamer to ABC and made a radio broadcast throughout the United States in which he said:

"The Jews of the world now declare a Holy War against Germany. We are now engaged in a sacred conflict against the Germans. And we are going to starve them into surrender. We are going to use a world-wide boycott against them, that will destroy them because they are dependent upon their export business."

And it is a fact that two thirds of Germany's food supply had to be imported, and it could only be imported with the proceeds of what they exported. Their labor. So if Germany could not export, two thirds of Germany's population would have to starve. There just was not enough food for more than one third of the population.

Now in this declaration, which I have here, it was printed on page -- a whole page -- in the New York Times on August 7, 1933, Mr. Samuel Untermyer boldly stated that: "this economic boycott is our means of self-defense. President Roosevelt has advocated its use in the NRA" . [National Recovery Administration] -- which some of you may remember, where everybody was to be boycotted unless they followed the rules laid down by the New Deal, which of course was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court at that time.

Nevertheless, the Jews of the world declared a boycott against Germany, and it was so effective that you couldn't find one thing in any store anywhere in the world with the words "made in Germany" on it.

In fact, an executive of the Woolworth Company told me that they had to dump millions of dollars worth of crockery and dishes into the river; that their stores were boycotted. If anyone came in and found a dish marked "made in Germany," they were picketed with signs: "Hitler", "murderer", and so forth, and like -- something like these sit-ins that are taking place in the South.

R. H. Macy, which is controlled by a family called Strauss who also happen to be Jews. . . a woman found stockings there which came from Chemnitz, marked "made in Germany". Well, they were cotton stockings. They may have been there 20 years, because since I've been observing women's legs in the last twenty years, I haven't seen a pair with cotton stockings on them. So Macy! I saw Macy boycotted, with hundreds of people walking around with signs saying "MURDERS" and "HITLERITES", and so forth.

Now up to that time, not one hair on the head of any Jew had been hurt in Germany. There was no suffering, there was no starvation, there was no murder, there was nothing.

Now up to that time, not one hair on the head of any Jew had been hurt in Germany. There was no suffering, there was no starvation, there was no murder, there was nothing.

Now, that. . . naturally, the Germans said, "Why, who are these people to declare a boycott against us and throw all our people out of work, and our industries come to a standstill? Who are they to do that to us?" They naturally resented it. Certainly they painted swastikas on stores owned by Jews.

Why should a German go in and give their money to a storekeeper who was part of a boycott who was going to starve Germany into surrender into the Jews of the world, who were going to dictate who their premier or chancellor was to be? Well, it was ridiculous.

That continued for some time, and it wasn't until 1938, when a young Jew from Poland walked into the German embassy in Paris and shot one of the officials [a German official] that the Germans really started to get rough with the Jews in Germany. And you found them then breaking windows and having street fights and so forth.

Now, for anyone to say that -- I don't like to use the word 'anti-Semitism' because it's meaningless, but it means something to you still, so I'll have to use it -- the only reason that there was any feeling in Germany against Jews was that they were responsible: number one, for World War One; number two, for this world-wide boycott, and number three -- did I say for World War One, they were responsible? For the boycott -- and also for World War II, because after this thing got out of hand, it was absolutely necessary for the Jews and Germany to lock horns in a war to see which one was going to survive.

In the meanwhile, I had lived in Germany, and I knew that the Germans had decided [that] Europe is going to be Christian or Communist: there is no in between. It's going to be Christian or it's going to be Communist. And the Germans decided: "We're going to keep it Christian if possible". And they started to re-arm.

And there intention was -- by that time the United States had recognized the Soviet Union, which they did in November, 1933 -- the Soviet Union was becoming very powerful, and Germany realized: "Well, our turn is going to come soon, unless we are strong." The same as we in this country are saying today, "Our turn is going to come soon, unless we are strong."

And our government is spending 83 or 84 billion dollars of your money for defense, they say. Defense against whom? Defense against 40,000 little Jews in Moscow that took over Russia, and then, in their devious ways, took over control of many other governments of the world.

Now, for this country to now be on the verge of a Third World War, from which we cannot emerge a victor, is something that staggers my imagination. I know that nuclear bombs are measured in terms of megatons. A megaton is a term used to describe one million tons of TNT. One million tons of TNT is a megaton. Now, our nuclear bombs have a capacity of 10 megatons, or 10 million tons of TNT. That was when they were first developed five or six years ago. Now, the nuclear bombs that are being developed have a capacity of 200 megatons, and God knows how many megatons the nuclear bombs of the Soviet Union have.

END

And your choice of words just reinforces that you see Jews as an infection. We talk about TUMORS and PARASITES being excised, Mr. Sungenis, not human beings. I really have to explain that? Human beings are attacked, persecuted, killed, murdered, expelled. So, sure, your choice of words also reveals contempt for Jews.

R. Sungenis: Oh, is that what God did in the Old Testament to the Jews? Are you saying he excised an infection? I think God will have something to say about your "choice of words." END

As for the plagiarism, you didn't read the article I gave the link to. It isn't about your old article. It's about the redone article on your website right now. There's still plagiarism in it right now (and other things that are out of line).

R. Sungenis: Never satisfied, are they? I suggest you deal with the evidence I put in that article and the evidence I put in this blog rather than try to deflect the truth by accusing me of your silly allegations that don't amount to a hill of beans. My patrons know I'm not a plagiarizer. 1/30/2015 2:27 PM

R. Sungenis: Never satisfied, are they? I suggest you deal with the evidence I put in that article and the evidence I put in this blog rather than try to deflect the truth by accusing me of your silly allegations that don't amount to a hill of beans. My patrons know I'm not a plagiarizer. All one need do is look at the meticulous footnotes I put in my books to know my level of scholarship and how I document and attribute sources to every fact I write. So you're barking up the wrong tree. The fact that neither you nor your cronies can let go of that silly accusation shows how desperate you are. If you had spent as much time investigating the causes for why the Jews were excised from all the countries they lived in, you wouldn't need to keep attacking me. Incidentally, the very person who started that silly accusation, William Cork, has since apostasized from the Church and joined the Seventh Day Adventists. END

As for Mr. Shocman, you'll have to show me your apology because I can't find it. This article sums up the last I read of where things stood with you and him: <http://www.pugiofidei.com/fraud.htm>.

R. Sungenis: Go ask Mr. Schoeman. I sent my apology to him. And while you are at it, ask him why he has never replied to me. END

About the rest of your answer, I have to basically agree with Paul Baylis. Although I don't take a stand one way or the other on Medugorje (I've seen good and bad), I think you're following E. Michael Jones and all the conspiracy paranoia too much. And I don't know if even Jones thinks that NASA uses lasers to make crop circles just to control us and turn people away from the Bible and Christ, like you wrote a little while back: <http://bellarmineforum.xanga.com/702646935/question-139---what-do-you-think-of-ufos/>

I haven't read much from him, but does he get into that kind of wacky paranoia? Does he believe the Jews sent in Monica Lewinsky to take Bill Clinton down? Does he believe Jews are controlling our phone lines like you do? Maybe he does but I haven't seen it.

R. Sungenis: E. Michael Jones is a truth teller. That's why we get along so well. Take a lesson. END

I can't figure out for the life of me how you believe all of this is helping anyone (nevermind Jews!) come to Jesus Christ. Maybe you're trying too hard to be a hero or something for everyone to follow, I don't know. And now you have your back up and are going to prove everyone wrong and you don't care how you do it?

R. Sungenis: This just tells me how your mind thinks. Let me clue you in. You are thinking incorrectly. Did it ever cross your mind that I'm willing to take all the abuse from people like you because I'm not as interested in my own reputation as I am about getting the truth out? The truth will set you free. And, by the way, if you don't like my explanation for crop circles, then you suggest a more cogent one and I will be the first to endorse it. END

I think most people who remember your better days are kind of hoping for a return of the "Not By" Robert Sungenis. It's too bad that he's been abducted by aliens (or Jews?). LOL. Joking!

Peace.

8/29/2009 9:20 PM JMTravers (message) reply @JMTravers -

R. Sungenis: Yes, of course, as long Robert Sungenis just criticizes the Protestants with "Not By" books he'll be accepted by the Catholic community at large. Who cares about the Protestants, right? But when he finds another and even fiercer enemy of the Church (the Jews) and criticizes them, all of a sudden Robert has been "abducted by aliens." Come on, Travers. Go read the newspapers. There's enough damning information about the Jewish influence and incursion into the Catholic Church just in the last two years to show I'm on the right track. The real problem is that there isn't one courageous Catholic apologist in America that is willing to take on the Jews. They are all too worried about their careers and making friends rather than the truth of what is really occurring in our land. And when you see that the very people who are accusing me with schoolyard accusations of "plagiarism" are the same people who won't say a word about what the Jews have tried to do in our Church for the last two years, then you know what the agenda is. They are just upset that Robert Sungenis won't play their game. Wonderful. I'm glad they are upset. That shows me I'm doing the right thing. END

If you don't believe what Robert has put it about the Influence of Zionism in America, and in the Catholic Church; I will like to recommend to you two Books: "Guilt by Association" and the Books of Viconte Poncins de Leon; and if you think these books are too biased read the

If you don't believe what Robert has put it about the Influence of Zionism in America, and in the Catholic Church; I will like to recommend to you two Books: "Guilt by Association," and the Books of Viconte Poncins de Leon; and if you think these books are too biased read the "Encyclopedia Judaic" of 1966. Gene546

8/30/2009 12:38 PM gene546 (message) reply Listen, I've read so much of this its coming out of my nose, okay? But I'm here shaking my head from what I'm reading. You're insulting my intelligence and everyone else who was crazy enough to follow all of his crap. Can we be real for a change, okay?

R. Sungenis: Oh, I see. When it accuses the Jews of malfeasance, it's "crap" to you. When it defends the Jews, it's truth. Yes, insulting intelligence is a two way street. END

For years your going on posting all this Jew bashing crap and finally your bishop had enough and you get a letter from him telling you to knock it off and what do you do, great obedient Catholic? You go on for another whole month posting more of it. So then on July 27th, 2007 you were called in to meet with your bishop about all your Jewish attacks. A few days after that you wrote "CAI and Its Teachings on the Jews." All of a sudden your meek as a lamb, right? And you went on and on about how great Bishop Rhoades was, okay? Here's what you wrote:

"I take their wisdom and counsel with the utmost seriousness and consider their direction as if it was from God himself. I consider it an honor not only to be a member of the Catholic Church but also to be under the vigilance of such wise and caring pastors. In short, I consider it a privilege to obey them.... Since he acts in God's stead, we will do our utmost to please him so as to preserve the peace and tranquility he so desires to maintain in the body of Christ." ~ Robert Sungenis

Now, that's very beautiful, okay? Sounds very Catholic!

But then in January 2008 you wrote Old Covenant Revoked or Not Revoked and you said something totally different about the same friggin meeting:

"I knew upon leaving the building the erroneous theology [Fr. King], Rhoades and the USCCB were attempting to propagate to unsuspecting Catholics." ~ Robert Sungenis

www.catholicintl.com/articles/The%20Old%20Covenant%20Revoked%20or%20Not%20Revoked%20for%20Culture%20Wars.pdf

So, are we supposed to believe you thought your bishop was acting in God's stead while he was putting over this horrible heresy on poor Catholics? Come on. Even you couldn't ask us to believe that! So you know were lying one time or the other. And seeing you were so angry at your bishop in the second article, it's not too hard to guess which time you lied, okay? Either that, or you basically sold out when you wrote the first article to just get the bishop's blessing or get out of dutch. So either way, you don't come out looking too good, okay?

R. Sungenis: You don't have the slightest idea what you are talking about, but that is only logical since you weren't there. Rhoades asked me to take it down but later said I could put it back up if I said it with more respect. I agreed. So I took it down and put it back up with more respect. But then his real agenda came out. He wasn't as interested in how nice I said it as much as WHAT I said. So when my redone post said the Jews were not the Chosen People any longer, and that the Old Covenant was revoked and no longer valid for the Jews (even though I said it very nicely and with respect), he wanted me to take it down. I refused, of course, because he had no right to tell me to take down the truth unless he could prove me wrong. He refused to prove me wrong. So there my material stays, and it was expanded in my article "The Old Covenant: Revoked or Not Revoked." Not only that, I find out later by the email I intercepted from Fr. King that Rhoades and King are, indeed, directly propagating the heresy of saying that the Old Covenant is still valid for the Jews, and slandering me in the process. Such good clerics they are. When I told them to cease and desist, they ignored me. The difference between me and you, however, is that I'm willing to stick my neck out and protect the Catholic people from the error that the Jews have shoved into our Church, while you and your cronies make up stories to make a pariah out of me. As I said in my last post, you will have God as your judge. END

And what about this? You told your friend Suter in an email on August 5, 2007 that you had to obey your bishop and take down your Jewish crap because he put you under an interdict.

"The fact is that I was under an interdict from my bishop. I had no choice unless I decided to directly disobey him." R. Sungenis

“The fact is that I was under an interdict from my bishop. I had no choice unless I decided to directly disobey him.” R. Sungenis

R. Sungenis: At that time I incorrectly used the word “interdict.” It felt like an interdict but I was not put under interdict. In fact, I was not put under any canonical judgment, except that I had not cleared the name “Catholic” with the bishop’s office before I used it in the title Catholic Apologetics International. Fr. Harrison makes it clear in his essay. The bottom line is, I followed every single canonical procedure with my bishop, and at no time did I disobey any canonical order he levied from his office. Those who say I did not obey my bishop are propagating falsehoods, but that is par for the course for them. END

The next day, you were writing to Forrest (whose NOT a friend) that your bishop didn’t make you do anything. You were doing it out of the goodness of your heart, being an obedient Catholic and all, right?

R. Sungenis: Correct, because I found out I was NOT under interdict. END

“I specifically stated in my recent posting that Bishop Rhoades did not conclude that I had to remove all the Jewish material from my website... As I specified in the above posting, I voluntarily took down the material...Why is it that you went against what my bishop concluded by claiming that the bishop demanded I remove the material, when, in fact, I stated that he did not do so?” “[The bishop] only asked that I would be more careful in my writing on the Jews...there is nothing more he requested.” ~ Robert Sungenis

http://sungenisandthejews.blogspot.com/2008/03/by-sungenis-alone_29.html#thirteen

R. Sungenis: Correct, and this corroborates my above explanation. Hence, the only “lies” are those being told by those who don’t know the truth about this issue. END

So you lied again, okay? Either you were pressured and forced by your bishop to stop attacking Jews or you weren't. Then to keep lying about your bishop? Are you kidding me? Then all the wa wa wa about Oh, they're out to get me, it's a conspiracy! Everything's a conspiracy to you for crying out loud, especially if you think those scary Jews are anywhere! Booga-booga! You really have brass ones, buddy. But you're not fooling anyone who isn't drinking your Kool-aide. Your bishop has my sympathies. Grow up.

Alex Pappas

8/31/2009 4:14 AM AlexPappas (message) reply

R. Sungenis: Obviously, Alex, it is you who has the “Booga-booga” problem, since your above attempt to string events together is obviously missing the crucial elements that I added. Go back and rethink what happened with the above information, and stop working off misconceptions, misinformation, mere guesses, and most of all, the hatred of my opponents for me and my courage to stand up for the truth.

- [8/31/2009 7:21 PM](#)
- [bellarmineforum](#) (message)
- [reply](#)

Mr. Sungenis, you wrote: "One also needs to inquire about the credentials and motivations of these people. Does the public recognize them as authorities on this or any relevant subject? Does the public recognize them as people who disseminate their ideas without bias? Are they sought out as speakers in public venues on these or any relevant issues? Do publishers of books or magazines seek to distribute their material? Do institutions of higher learning seek for their opinion?"

Before you fly off like this, do you ever apply the same litmus test to yourself that you do to people you're criticizing? Does the public recognize YOU as an authority on Jews and Judaism? Does the public recognize YOU as a person who disseminates his ideas about Jews and Judaism without bias? Are YOU sought out as a speaker about Jews and Judaism? Do publishers seek to distribute YOUR material on Jews and Judaism (other than other Jew-obsessers like E. Michael Jones)? Do institutions of higher learning seek for YOUR opinion on Jews and Judaism?

Pretty much NO across the board, right?

Isn't that exactly the point? You've been snouting off dishonestly and irresponsibly about Jews and Judaism for years now, presenting yourself

Pretty much NO across the board, right?

Isn't that exactly the point? You've been spouting off dishonestly and irresponsibly about Jews and Judaism for years now, presenting yourself as an objective authority or expert when you're obviously not. Even on theological questions about Jews you can't seem to manage to remain fair.

So, when you're called to account by friends, supporters, et al, you fly into a rage, attack them, eventually kind of apologize, say you've been misunderstood and then you eventually go right back to attacking Jews again. How many times now? According to this article, it's something like four times now going on five:

<http://sungenisandthejews.blogspot.com/2008/02/saying-peace-when-there-is-no-peace.html>

I think most people would call that an obsession.

So how can any reasonable person take your apologies seriously? Really. Even this Q/A and the comments you've made are filled with more proof that you really have a serious problem when it comes to Jews. So your bishop was right to tell you to stop writing about Jews. But I guess you've decided to play bishop yourself and that's a very spiritually dangerous choice. And what of every other person you lead down that dangerous path with you? You're responsible for them, too.

I don't know what's driving you - I suspect pride - but I don't delight in it at all. I don't think anyone does (at least I hope not). It's confounding and incredibly sad.

- [8/31/2009 7:36 PM](#)
- [kdsmith \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

•

I just read your answer to Mr. Pappas. I think you missed his point about what you wrote about your meeting with Bishop Rhoades, Mr. Sungenis. Right after your meeting, you glowed about how wonderful he was and how he was God's servant or what have you. Then after Bishop Rhoades decided that you shouldn't be writing about Jews (a reasonable opinion, in my view), you completely changed your story about what happened at the meeting in July. After you became angry, you now said that you knew RIGHT AS YOU LEFT THE BUILDING after that meeting that he was trying to spread heresy to Catholics.

Both cannot be true. So Mr. Pappas' point (although not very tactful) still stands unanswered.

About the notes to Suter and Forest, I don't think your answer holds water, either. You wrote to both of them within one day of each other. If you knew you weren't under interdict just one day later, then why didn't you write about it then? It looks as though you only came to that conclusion some time later when Fr. Harrison looked everything over and wrote his article.

About your choice of words, (talking about Jews who have infected the Church and having them excised), your answers don't do much to make you look better. You have a very ugly penchant for adopting the language of contempt that the Church has repudiated. I side with your bishop and plead with you to change course before it's too late.

- [8/31/2009 7:51 PM](#)
- [kdsmith \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

•

The fact is that I already challenge one these guys about you orthodox position defending our Church and her history as the sole instrument to had civilized the Western World; even unto the arbitrary position taken by the Talmudic Jews. Who by distorting the History has accused with lies those who stand in the front line of the defense of our Mother Church? I asked this guy to read the *“Encyclopedia Judaica of 1966*, the starting point of our debate, and then the books of Viconte Poncins de Leon, but so far, there is no response from these guys. Don't bent your knee, nor bow your head to the genocide of the Jews people. And the reason being is, what about the other 34 million people slaughter in WWII? You're not alone Robert, the truth and my humble knowledge about the real facts between our Mother Church and the Zionists, will suffice to keep them within the limits of their realm: lies.

- [9/1/2009 11:40 AM](#)
- [gene546 \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

•

[@bellarmineforum](#) - Robert Sungenis....or should I say Robert SAN GENESI? You know, I've been doing a little research into you and your family and I've encountered some very, very interesting information. It turns out that your heritage is Italian (possibly Sicilian) and your family changed their name to try to hide your ethnicity. I think we can probably guess why that is, can't we?

Now, don't misunderstand me. I've had friends who are Italian, even Sicilian. I love the ones that are smart enough to know their place and I want to help them. So I don't mean that all Italians and Sicilians are evil (just most of them). Please, no one calumniate me by calling me Anti-Italian or Anti-Sicilian. I don't hate Italians because of their RACE. The problem is their corrupt culture and belief system. It's morally depraved and Mr. Sungenis is just a product of that morally depraved upbringing and culture. But we need to expose it for the good of humanity and the Church.

The moral depravity rampant in Italy, (especially Sicily) is the stuff of legend. Scores of books have been written about it. The Mafia: gunrunning, bootlegging, prostitution, counterfeiting, bookmaking, loan sharking, Sicilian "neck ties". Rampant superstition. Quarrelling, fighting, lifelong vendettas over trivial matters. Sexual promiscuity, you know those swarthy devils are always on the prowl. Everybody knows how they are. Immoral politicians like Rudy Giuliani. Perverted entertainers like Madonna. So, of course, lying is nothing to a Italian (especially a Sicilian). I'm sorry if I upset anyone by that statement. But I have to speak the truth. They even put it into their laws--read here: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/7284134.stm>.

Few people know that it was an Italian-American (last name Valenti) who allowed all the smut in Hollywood by dismantling the Hayes Production Code (see here: http://www.knowledgerush.com/kr/encyclopedia/Hayes_Code/). Paved the way for the likes of Bob Guccione and his massive Penthouse empire, spreading pornography everywhere. And Italians are known to wink at pedophilia (see here: [http://www.knowledgerush.com/kr/encyclopedia/Hayes_Code/](#)).

Few people know that it was an Italian-American (last name Valenti) who allowed all the smut in Hollywood by dismantling the Hayes Production Code (see here: http://www.knowledgerush.com/kr/encyclopedia/Hayes_Code/). Paved the way for the likes of Bob Guccione and his massive Penthouse empire, spreading pornography everywhere. And Italians are known to wink at pedophilia (see here: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/1577953/Lolita-love-affair-scandalises-Italy.html>). That's just how they are, how they were taught. Of course, few of you know this because Italians control the media through fear. And let's not forget that Italians were behind the murder of JFK. In the book "Double Cross", Sam and Chuck Giancana reveal that the Mafia murdered JFK. No wonder that Mr. San Genesi wants to shift the blame to Jews, because he's protecting the Mafia like a good little Italian.

Italians have even infiltrated and infected the Church for centuries. Mafiosos regularly buy off prelates around the world with blood money to get them to do their bidding. The Italian-American Civil Rights League was founded by a mobster (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Italian-American_Civil_Rights_League) with the help of Frank Sinatra and Hollywood. The Mafia is a potent force to be reckoned with and I am probably in mortal danger by even writing this. In fact, Mr. San Genesi is looking more and more like a Mafia mole all the time. He owes all Catholics a sworn affidavit that he is not and never has been part of the Mafia, otherwise as far as I'm concerned he's suspect.

Bottom line is that because I'm incredibly courageous, I will forge on. Italian moral depravity and the drive to control the world is nefarious and it must be exposed no matter how many people say really mean things to me. The more they tell me to stop, the more I am certain I'm doing the right thing.

Your nephew, Pab Sungenis, (who has some interesting things to say about you here: <http://cnx.com/?p=761>) let the cat out of the bag about your Italian ethnic background:

"Is Sungenis Italian? You're the first person to guess it correctly. Most people think it's Greek. My original family name...was 'San Genesi'" <http://scottnickel.blogspot.com/2009/06/20-questions-with-pab-sungenis.html>

So there it is. Case closed.

(For the sake of those who are in any doubt, that was a satire - Mr. Sungenis' dishonesty is all his own, and I hold Italy and Italians in general innocent for his multiple moral failures.)

Dale

- [9/2/2009 3:34 PM](#)
- [swede4life \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

•

Now, let me be serious. I've been watching the Sungenis demise for some years now. In my occupation I deal with people like you all the time, Robert. The problem in your case is that you suffer from literary diarrhea. You're on the public record more than enough to prove that you're a liar. So, you want a canonical trial? Do you think the canonists at the Vatican are dim-wits? They would roast you over a slow fire.

The first goal for any prosecuting attorney is to destroy the credibility of the witness. That certainly does not bode well for you! You complain that people are only looking at one side of the story. The problem is that even when we get your defense, it ends up being quite literally a joke. I've watched this happen repeatedly over the years. The accusation is made and you sputter out some defense that's so full of holes that it just digs you in deeper. We see it right here.

In your July 31, 2007 article you stated plainly that your removal of Jewish material from your web site was purely VOLUNTARY. Nothing about any compulsion or "interdict" at all.

Then, just a couple of days later you emailed Edgar Suter, stating that you were ORDERED to obey your bishop in regard to removing your articles attacking Jews because you were under an "INTERDICT".

Then the VERY NEXT DAY, you emailed Michael Forrest, stating that you were NOT ORDERED in any way by your bishop to remove your articles attacking Jews. And, here's the clincher, you referred to your own article from July 31, 2007 as proof that it was VOLUNTARY. <http://sungenisandthejews.blogspot.com/2008/09/fr-harrison-and-rsatj.html>

There's no way to explain doing a complete about-face between your article and what you wrote to Suter a couple of days later, especially because the next day you wrote to Forrest and pointed to your article as proof that you were never ordered! Your claim here that you thought you were under interdict when writing to Suter just won't fly.

Sorry Robert, but you're lying.

I think that Alex Pappas has nailed down another clear one. Your assessment of the original meeting with your bishop, written just a few days after, contained effusive language about how great he is: "wise and caring pastors", "he acts in God's stead", etc. But a few months later, about the very same meeting, you stated that UPON LEAVING THE BUILDING you "knew" they were spreading heresy: "I knew upon leaving the building the erroneous theology [Fr. King], Rhoades and the USCCB were attempting to propagate to unsuspecting Catholics." Sorry Robert, you've been caught lying again.

And that episode with Roy Schoeman is a real head shaker too. You screw up and attribute a false quote to Schoeman and then relentlessly bully the guy who tells you it's bogus. Say publicly that you don't know if the quote is bogus while privately you absolutely do know. Ben Douglass indicates that you admitted that the correspondence is from you, so I don't see how you're going to wiggle out of that one. It's all here, read it and weep: <http://www.pugiofidei.com/fraud.htm>

Oh and by the way, Robert, if you use someone else's words and don't give them credit in any way, it's plagiarism. Period. You have been caught dead to rights on this numerous times and yes, it's up on your web site right now. The lies, the false accusations, the false quotes, the plagiarism. It has been a real train wreck.

You may consider this all exciting, but I would submit that your soul is in serious danger. You need to set things right, truly right, and not just issue another of your bogus "apologies". This is serious stuff and I'm sad to see it come to this.

Dale

You may consider this all exciting, but I would submit that your soul is in serious danger. You need to set things right, truly right, and not just issue another of your bogus "apologies". This is serious stuff and I'm sad to see it come to this.

Dale

- [9/2/2009 3:35 PM](#)
- [swede4life](#) (message)
- [reply](#)

```
<link rel="File-List" href="http://anonymouse.org/cgi-bin/anon-www.cgi/file:
///C:%5CDOCUME%7E1%5CGREG%7E1.THE%5CLOCALS%7E1%5CTemp%5Cmshtmlclip1%5C01%5Cclip_filelist.xml"><link
rel="themeData" href="http://anonymouse.org/cgi-bin/anon-www.cgi/file:
///C:%5CDOCUME%7E1%5CGREG%7E1.THE%5CLOCALS%7E1%5CTemp%5Cmshtmlclip1%5C01%5Cclip_themedata.thmx"><link
rel="colorSchemeMapping" href="http://anonymouse.org/cgi-bin/anon-www.cgi/file:
///C:%5CDOCUME%7E1%5CGREG%7E1.THE%5CLOCALS%7E1%5CTemp%5Cmshtmlclip1%5C01%5Cclip_colorschememapping.xml">
```

Normal
0

false
false
false

EN-US
X-NONE
X-NONE

MicrosoftInternetExplorer4

```
<w:latentstyles deflockedstate="false" defunhidewhenused="true"
defsemihidden="true" defqformat="false" depriority="99"
latentstylecount="267">
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="0" semihidden="false"
unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="Normal"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="9" semihidden="false"
unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="heading 1"/>
```


<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="10" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="Title"/>

<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="11" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="Subtitle"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="22" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="Strong"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="20" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="Emphasis"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="59" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Table Grid"/>

<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="1" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="No Spacing"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="60" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Light Shading"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="61" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Light List"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="62" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Light Grid"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="63" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Medium Shading 1"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="64" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Medium Shading 2"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="65" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Medium List 1"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="66" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Medium List 2"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="67" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Medium Grid 1"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="68" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Medium Grid 2"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="69" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Medium Grid 3"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="70" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Dark List"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="71" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Colorful Shading"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="72" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Colorful List"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="73" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Colorful Grid"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="60" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Light Shading Accent 1"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="61" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Light List Accent 1"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="62" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Light Grid Accent 1"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="63" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Medium Shading 1 Accent 1"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="64" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Medium Shading 2 Accent 1"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="65" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Medium List 1 Accent 1"/>

<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="34" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="List Paragraph"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="29" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="Quote"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="30" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="Intense Quote"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="66" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Medium List 2 Accent 1"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="67" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Medium Grid 1 Accent 1"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="68" semihidden="false" unhidewhenused="false" name="Medium Grid 2 Accent 1"/>

[illegible]

[illegible]

```

<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="" semihidden="false"
unhidewhenused="false" name="Dark List Accent 6"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="71" semihidden="false"
unhidewhenused="false" name="Colorful Shading Accent 6"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="72" semihidden="false"
unhidewhenused="false" name="Colorful List Accent 6"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="73" semihidden="false"
unhidewhenused="false" name="Colorful Grid Accent 6"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="19" semihidden="false"
unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="Subtle Emphasis"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="21" semihidden="false"
unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="Intense Emphasis"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="31" semihidden="false"
unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="Subtle Reference"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="32" semihidden="false"
unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="Intense Reference"/>
<w:lsdexception locked="false" priority="33" semihidden="false"
unhidewhenused="false" qformat="true" name="Book Title"/>

```

```

/* Style Definitions */

```

```

table.MsoNormalTable
{ mso-style-name:"Table Normal";
mso-tstyle-rowband-size:0;
mso-tstyle-colband-size:0;
mso-style-noshow:yes;
mso-style-priority:99;
mso-style-qformat:yes;
mso-style-parent:"";
mso-padding-alt:0in 5.4pt 0in 5.4pt;
mso-para-margin-top:0in;
mso-para-margin-right:0in;
mso-para-margin-bottom:10.0pt;
mso-para-margin-left:0in;
line-height:115%;
mso-pagination:widow-orphan;
font-size:11.0pt;
font-family:"Calibri", "sans-serif";
mso-ascii-font-family:Calibri;
mso-ascii-theme-font:minor-latin;
mso-fareast-font-family:"Times New Roman";
mso-fareast-theme-font:minor-fareast;
mso-hansi-font-family:Calibri;
mso-hansi-theme-font:minor-latin;}

```

Robert Sungenis has more guts than all his detractors.
His kind of intellectual guts really are just plain old critical
thinking. His detractors are made delusional by the currents of
intellectual power, and it is they who are therefore made ignorant.
Whoever has the loudest voice at present is who they follow. Robert has
the manhood to carve his own way through the morass and not be afraid to seek
the real story-the truth.

Why can't his detractors understand this about him and
respect his character and courage? They may
not agree with him, but they should at least make some effort to see that he is
thinking critically, and not attempting to defame any people personally. He punches through social taboos, and does
not let them cloud his vision, as any true scholar should. He is sincere in his scholarship and offers
very valid points. The problem is that
he's right on so much, and this threatens people in powerful positions. And that is why they seek to destroy
him. Plain old human lust for power. This is the same treatment Rush Limbaugh gets
from his detractors. It doesn't matter
if he's right; he threatens their power and he must be discredited.

I don't agree with every single point Robert makes, but I
enjoy following his thinking and I greatly respect his scholarship. I can follow and respect any such man as long
as he is sincere. God bless Robert
Sungenis for doing what we all should be taught in grade school, and that is,
think through the issues and don't be swayed by peer pressure. The world needs more men like Robert.

- [9/2/2009 11:29 PM](#)
- [Seeker1998](#) (message)
- [reply](#)

- [Seeker1998 \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

Robert Sungenis has more guts than all his detractors. His kind of intellectual guts really are just plain old critical thinking. His detractors are made delusional by the currents of intellectual power, and it is they who are therefore made ignorant. Whoever has the loudest voice at present is who they follow. Robert has the manhood to carve his own way through the morass and not be afraid to seek the real story-the truth.

Why can't his detractors understand this about him and respect his character and courage? They may not agree with him, but they should at least make some effort to see that he is thinking critically, and not attempting to defame any people personally. He punches through social taboos, and does not let them cloud his vision, as any true scholar should. He is sincere in his scholarship and offers very valid points. The problem is that he's right on so much, and this threatens people in powerful positions. And that is why they seek to destroy him. Plain old human lust for power. This is the same treatment Rush Limbaugh gets from his detractors. It doesn't matter if he's right; he threatens their power and he must be discredited.

I don't agree with every single point Robert makes, but I enjoy following his thinking and I greatly respect his scholarship. I can follow and respect any such man as long as he is sincere. God bless Robert Sungenis for doing what we all should be taught in grade school, and that is, think through the issues and don't be swayed by peer pressure. The world needs more men like Robert.

- [9/2/2009 11:39 PM](#)
- [Seeker1998 \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

[@bellarmineforum](#) -

Mr. Sungenis,

You said that the guy just totally made up the quote about Jews infecting the Church. You were wrong, his quote was correct. So, I wrote "infection" instead of "infected". I made a mistake and used the noun form instead of the verb form of infect. Mea culpa. But, that's your best rejoinder? You still think it's just fine to write that Jews infect the Church? Wow. Thankfully, your bishop and the Pope would no doubt still find your statement completely repulsive as should any person with an ounce Catholic charity and historical sense. But then again, you've been dishonest about the Pope's statements on the Holocaust, trying to make him sound like he sees things your way.

<http://sungenisandthejews.blogspot.com/2009/05/pope-benedict-xvi-continues-to.html>

So maybe you'll argue that the Pope agrees with you saying that Jews infect the Church, that they're "excised" wherever they go and that it's their fault.

Now, you were very adamant and angry about "infection" vs. "infected", so when did God ever use the exact word "excised" when talking about Jews in the Bible, Mr. Sungenis? I don't remember any verse where God said he "excised" the Jews. But even if He did, if God wants to show contempt for Jews or anyone else with such words, He's God so He can! He knows everything perfectly. He doesn't lie. He doesn't make mistakes. You're not God!

Or do you think you're a prophet? No prophet ever made the kinds of mistakes you make. No prophet ever lied like you've lied. No prophet ever used the kind of putrid sources of information that you use to attack Jews. God doesn't get things wrong. God's prophets don't get it wrong. So you're doing this all on your own or maybe with the help of some other spiritual guide, Mr. Sungenis. It's that simple.

And your contemptuous and dishonest words about Jews are exactly why your bishop told you stop writing about them. That's why everyone has urged you to stop, not because you're really "on to something." Wow. And to see how people like "seeker1998" are being influenced by your conspiracy paranoia is heartbreaking. These people look up to you and what do you do to them? You lead them into the dark conspiracy pit with you! I honestly pray that God doesn't hold you responsible for what you are doing or that you repent and try to repair the harm you have done.

- [9/3/2009 1:42 PM](#)
- [JMTravers \(message\)](#)
- [reply](#)

[@bellarmineforum](#) -

To continue, the difference with your work on Protestants/Protestantism and Jews/Judaism is that you haven't gone dumpster-diving trying to dredge up any thing you can find to paint them as slime. (The satire that Dale posted above about Italians is pretty much smack on the target, btw.) You haven't plagiarized white supremacists, Nazis, and others to make your case. You haven't stereotyped them. You haven't slandered and disobeyed your bishop because of Protestants. You haven't been turned down for imprimaturs on your books about Protestantism. And so you sold a lot of books about Protestantism because people respected your work. But your work on Jews has only sullied your reputation and hurt the Church. It only resonates with certain people who either look up to you from your past work or who have the same affinity for conspiracy paranoia.

Is it possible so many people are right, that you're completely out of control when it comes to Jews? No, according to you, it must be that people are afraid of the Jews and Jews are pulling the strings behind the curtain! Wow. Your conspiracy paranoia is doing you in. And you're dragging in poor souls like seeker1998. It's terrible to watch.

And saying that you don't plagiarize won't change the fact that you've plagiarized a great deal, Mr. Sungenis. I know it's embarrassing, but it's true. In the article on your website right now, you still have plagiarized material from Fr. Fahey, Mohr, Dilling and Hoffman. The last three are blatant anti-Semites. The proof that you do plagiarize is right here:

<http://sungenisandthejews.blogspot.com/2009/07/lies-plagiarism-and-anti-semites.html>

Ignoring it won't make it go away. Admitting it, fixing it and apologizing for it squarely will, in time. And the fact that you know how to give proper credit just makes your plagiarism all the worse. What's even worse is that YOU STILL SELL AN AUDIO TAPE OF THE ORIGINAL ARTICLE WITH ALL THE PLAGIARIZED QUOTES IN IT. Don't you know what's on your own website?